



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,465	11/08/2001	Yuichi Kagami	D-1213	5095

32628 7590 10/04/2005

KANESAKA BERNER AND PARTNERS LLP
SUITE 300, 1700 DIAGONAL RD
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2848

EXAMINER

BRINICH, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/986,465

Applicant(s)

KAGAMI, YUICHI

Examiner

Stephen M. Brinich

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 6-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/08/2001.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6, 8-9, & 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al.

Re claims 1, 6, 8-9, & 11, Park et al discloses (column 3, lines 33-53) an image processing apparatus in which a plurality of image input data are stored for a plurality of color components, and correction values are stored for the color components to produce a correct output color. The storage order of the correction values is modified in accordance with a command to store these values in a specified order. In response to these values, a correct color value is determined and used to form output image data.

Park et al does not disclose two separate data storage means, a first one for the original color correction values and

Art Unit: 2624

a second one for storing the color correction values in a specified order.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a second data storage means to store the resequenced values in the final specified order. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the overwriting of one or more of the values during the resequencing process (if both the original and resequenced values are to be stored in the same data storage means).

3. Claims 7 & 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al in view of Applicant's disclosed Prior Art.

Re claims 7 & 10, Park et al does not disclose the use of a matrix operation in color image processing.

Applicant's disclosed Prior Art (Specification, paragraph 0006) describes the use of a matrix operation in color processing.

Park et al and Applicant's disclosed Prior Art are combinable because they are from the field of color image processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use matrix operation

Art Unit: 2624

processing in processing the color images of Park et al. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to produce more accurate output color.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Park with Applicant's disclosed Prior Art to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 & 10.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 2-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Re claim 2, the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited resorting operation in conjunction with the recited storage of color values in a specified order in response to a command.

Re claim 3, the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited address translating operation in conjunction with the recited storage of color values in a specified order in response to a command.

Re claim 4, the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited specifying of a single correction value in conjunction

Art Unit: 2624

with the recited storage of color values in a specified order in response to a command.

Re claim 5, the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited use of more than two value data for each of the three primary color constituents in conjunction with the recited storage of color values in a specified order in response to a command.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yamauchi et al, Yamazaki, and Pettitt et al disclose further examples of color image processing and color correction.

7. Any inquiry concerning the contents of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430.

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application or proceeding or any inquiry of a general nature concerning application processing should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 703-308-4357.

The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2624

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 571-273-8300 (as of July 15, 2005).

Hand-carried correspondence may be delivered to the Customer Service Window, located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Stephen Brinich". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized 'S' and 'B'.

Stephen M Brinich
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

smb
September 29, 2005